REMARKS

Claims 1-32, 34-35, 38-52, 54-55, 58-72, 74-75, 78-91, 95-102, 106-118, and 121-125 are now pending in the application. Claims 33, 36, 37, 53, 56, 57, 73, 76, 77, 92-94, 103-105, and 119-120 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice to the subject matter contained therein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the drawings and specification. As such, no new matter is added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 31-39, 41, 45-49, 51-59, 61, 65-69, 71-79, 81, 85-88, 90-96, 101-107, 111-115, and 117-122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pollanen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,289,205). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 31, Pollanen fails to show, teach, or suggest a voltage scaling ratio controller for controlling a voltage scaling ratio of the voltage scaler to maintain the voltage signal within a predetermined voltage range based on a plurality of stored target output power levels and corresponding voltage scaling ratios.

An exemplary embodiment shown in FIG. 1 of the present invention illustrates a voltage detector 110 that includes a voltage scaler 135 and a ratio controller 150. The ratio controller 150 "can be comprised of any type of processor and computer memory. The voltage scaling ratio controller 150 can set the voltage scaling ratio of the voltage scaler 135 based upon a predetermined target output power of the power amplifier 105. For example, the system 100 can have a plurality of associated target output power

levels...each target output power level can be associated with a different voltage scaling ratio." (Paragraph [0070]). In other words, the voltage scaling ratio controller 150 controls the voltage scaling ratio to maintain the voltage signal within a predetermined voltage range based on a plurality of stored target output power levels and corresponding voltage scaling ratios.

In contrast, the Examiner alleges that FIG. 9 of Pollanen discloses a voltage scaling ratio controller A1. Applicants respectfully note that element A1 is a comparator. The comparator A1 receives inputs from transistor T1. As such, the comparator A1 does not control a voltage scaling ratio based on a plurality of stored target output power levels and corresponding voltage scaling ratios as claim 1 recites. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 31, as well as its dependent claims, should be allowable for at least the above reasons. Claims 51, 71, 90, 101, and 117, as well as their corresponding dependent claims, should be allowable for at least similar reasons.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 1-30 are allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowable subject matter. Applicants amended independent claims 51, 71, 90, 101, and 117 to incorporate the subject matter that the Examiner indicated to be allowable in claims 1-30. As such, no new issues are raised. Applicant respectfully submit that claims 31, 51, 71, 90, 101, and 117 should be allowable for at least similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 25, 2007

By: _____
Michael D. Wiggins
Reg. No. 34,754

Damian M. Aquino
Reg. No. 54,964

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDW/DMA/dms